

Remarks

In this Response various amendments have been presented to the abstract, described above and discussed below.

In this Response Formal drawings for Figs. 1-9 have been presented on replacement sheets 1-8 as formal replacement figures for previously presented FIGs. 1-9 presented on original sheets 1-8. Additionally, amendments have been presented to FIGs. 5a-5c, discussed below.

Objections to Drawings

Applicant has amended Figs. 5a-5c to show display **14**, as described in corresponding discussions in the specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Objections to Abstract

Applicant has presented amendments to the Abstract. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Elections/Restrictions

Applicants have withdrawn claims 6-14 and 25-30. Claims 19 and 24 were previously withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 15-18, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Penn (US App No. 2002/0093499) (hereinafter “Penn”). The Applicant traverses this rejection of these claims.

Claim 1 recites an apparatus comprising:

a light source to generate light;
a transfective color filter optically coupled to the light source, to receive the light along an incident axis, said transfective color filter including at least one

color passband to transmit at least a portion of light within a range of frequencies, and to reflect, along a reflectance axis, at least a portion of light outside of the range of frequencies, with the incident and the reflectance axes being non-coincident; and

a recycling subsystem optically coupled to the transflective color filter, having an input positioned on the reflectance axis and an output, the recycling subsystem to receive the reflected light through the input, and to emit recycled light through the output towards the transflective color filter.

As can be seen, claim 1 recites a recycling subsystem having an input on a reflectance axis, the reflectance axis being non-coincident with an incident axis.

Penn does not teach, either inherently or expressly, a recycling subsystem having an input on a reflectance axis, which is non-coincident with the incident axis. In the Office Action, it is stated that that Penn discloses a recycling subsystem at page 3, paragraph [0040] in reference to FIG. 5. This portion of Penn illustrates a dashed outline **502** showing an outline of the light path used for a sequential color recycling system on the transflective color filter **500**.

While Penn does not teach how the color recycling system actually works, it is clear that it does not have an input on a reflectance axis which is non-coincident with the incident axis. FIG. 7 illustrates a projection system using a filter **600**, which may be similar to filter **500**. The light from the light source **702** is folded ninety degrees by a TIR surface of an integrating rod **706**. The light path is then presented to the filter segments of the filter **600** along an incident axis orthogonal to the filter segments. Thus, in Penn, the reflectance axis of the filter **600** will be co-incident with its incident axis. Therefore, Penn does not fairly teach or suggest having a recycling subsystem with an input on a reflectance axis that is non-coincident with the incident axis as is recited in claim 1, for example.

Because Penn does not teach every element of this claim, an anticipation rejection is improper based on this article.

Claims 2-5, 15-18, and 20-23 depend from, or include limitations similar to, claim 1. Therefore, these claims are patentable over Penn for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 103

In the Office Action, Claims 20-23 are additionally rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Penn.

As discussed above, Penn fails to teach a transfective color filter reflecting light along a reflectance axis that is non-coincident with an incident axis, which is an element recited in these claims. Furthermore, Penn fails to fairly suggest this element. There is no motivation in Penn or elsewhere, to modify Penn in a manner to provide this element. Therefore, these claims are patentable over Penn for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, the Applicants believe the claims as presented are patentable over the cited articles. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 5/17/2006

/Nathan R. Maki/
Reg. No. 51110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981